



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,657	05/02/2001	Teresa G. Winter	WR151-BIGW	7080

7590 11/12/2003

DISHONG LAW OFFICES
40 Bryant Road
Jaffrey, NH 03452

EXAMINER

KATCHEVES, BASIL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,657

Applicant(s)

WINTER, TERESA G.

Examiner

Basil Katcheves

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because figure 1 contains text and figure 1A has component numbers which are difficult to read. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the ram lock devices must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Because the ram locks are not shown in detail in the drawings, the examiner will best interpret these in the rejection below until further clarification.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,088,259 to Myers.

Regarding claim 1, Myers discloses a wall panel containing a ribbed interior skin (fig. 3: 18), a flat exterior skin (fig. 3: 30), a foam core shaped to fit between the two skins (fig. 3: 50) and slots on the core running axially along the length of a rib (fig. 3: 54).

Regarding claim 2, Myers discloses a metal ribbed skin (column 2, line 64).

Regarding claim 3, Myers discloses the exterior skin as fiberglass (column 3, lines 49-51).

Regarding claim 4, Myers discloses the use of foam cores (figs. 1-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,088,259 to Myers in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,991,855 to Buell et al.

Regarding claim 5, Myers discloses vertical edges on the ribbed skin but does not disclose the vertical edges as being terminated at a point half the width of a rib. Buell discloses a ribbed wall structure having a ribbed skin which has vertical sides which are terminated at a mid point of the rib width (fig. 2 & 3: 35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Myers by using the sidewalls disclosed by Buell in order to create a better fit between the ribbed skins, as disclosed by Buell in fig. 2, and provide a more secure, smoother connection.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,991,855 to Buell et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,936,071 to Karrfalt.

Regarding claim 7, Buell discloses two ribbed panels joined together at a point between ribs (fig. 2). Buell also discloses the connection as flush. Buell does not disclose a cap over the mid rib section. Karrfalt discloses a ribbed panel joint

construction (fig. 1) having a cap over the rib connection area (fig. 1: 16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Buell by adding the cap disclosed by Karrfalt in order to better secure the ribbed panel connection and protect the fasteners.

Regarding claim 8, Karrfalt discloses the cap as being adjacent to the rib panel connection (fig. 1).

Claims 9, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,991,855 to Buell et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,290,845 to Snyder.

Regarding claims 9, 10, 13 and 14, Buell discloses two ribbed panels joined together at a point between ribs (fig. 2). Buell also discloses the connection as flush with no overlap of panels. However, Buell does not disclose the use of ram locks. Snyder discloses ribbed panels joined together by use of ram locks (fig. 3: 27). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Buell by using the ram locks disclosed by Snyder in order to create a better seal between ribs.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,991,855 to Buell et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,038,573 to Nuernberger.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Buell discloses two ribbed panels joined together at a point between ribs (fig. 2). Buell also discloses the connection as flush with no overlap of panels. However, Buell does not disclose the use of grommets. Nuernberger discloses ribbed panels joined together by grommets (fig. 2: 20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Buell by using the grommets disclosed by Nuernberger in order to create a better seal between ribs.


Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited patents listed on the included form PTO-892 further show the state of the art with respect to ribbed panels in general.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (703) 306-0232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman, can be reached at (703) 308-0832.

BK 

10/9/03


Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600